

**To:** Ball, Harold[Ball.Harold@epa.gov]  
**From:** Jeff R. Collins  
**Sent:** Mon 9/18/2017 5:06:06 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Anaconda conceptual site model

Thanks Harry, that's a very good observation and question. I haven't read through the DSR yet, but if Copper is saying there is no longer a source from the ponds effecting groundwater, then we need to take a harder look at the monitoring well information to see if that correlates and start asking some more detailed questions about those findings. They're basically saying that with the current amount of water entering those ponds, there's not enough head pressure to drive the contaminants vertically. That could be, but is there a huge smear zone remaining for groundwater fluctuations to impact that continue to source the plume? I think NDEP would say there is still a source in OU-4a that needs to be dealt with. How that source can be mitigated is another question. Jeryl's on vacation for the next three weeks and he didn't relay any chatter on this topic from his conference calls with ARC before he left last week, but I'll start bringing this conclusion to everyone's attention.

I don't believe this completely changes the way we are planning on approaching groundwater cleanup evaluation at the site (from a source first standpoint), but these types of conclusions (if there is complete agreement by NDEP) would speed up the process for performing off-site GW FS work. Good luck this week with the tribes. We'll talk to you Tuesday afternoon.



Jeff Collins, Chief

Bureau of Corrective Actions

Nevada Division of Environmental Protection

901 South Stewart Street, Suite 4001

Carson City, NV 89701

p: 775.687.9381

[jrcollins@ndep.nv.gov](mailto:jrcollins@ndep.nv.gov)

[www.ndep.nv.gov](http://www.ndep.nv.gov)

**From:** Ball, Harold [mailto:Ball.Harold@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 15, 2017 12:01 PM  
**To:** Jeff R. Collins <jrcollins@ndep.nv.gov>  
**Subject:** Anaconda conceptual site model

Jeff: We should probably discuss this further but I thought I should send you this inquiry to consider first. I have heard that the most recent Evap Ponds Data Summary Report essentially concludes that there is currently no sourcing of contaminants from OU4a to groundwater. See Fig 4-2 attached. So, I am having a hard time aligning that conclusion with the State's position that the effect of an OU4a remedy on groundwater would need to be evaluated before considering an FS for the off-property groundwater remedy. Do you have any perspective on this? Regards, Harry

=====

Harold Ball, Chief, NV & Federal Facilities Section (S82), EPA Region 9 Superfund, w) 415.972.3047, c) 415.819.9821, [ball.harold@epa.gov](mailto:ball.harold@epa.gov)